

FEB 14 1918.  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
LIBRARY

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XI.

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1918

No. 16

## *Just Published*

### Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

VOLUME XX

## GAIUS VERRES

*An Historical Study*

by FRANK HEWITT COWLES

Price One Fifty

Other Volumes of the series are:

- I. The CUM Constructions: their history and functions, by William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii: Constructive, 1889. (Out of Print.)
- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887. (Out of Print.)
- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894. (Price 80 cts.)
- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George Willis Botsford, 1893. (Price \$1.50.)
- V. Index Antiphonteus: composuit Frank Lovis van Cleef, 1895. (Price \$1.00.)
- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles Elmer, 1898. (Price \$1.50.)
- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- IX. Critique of some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by Charles Edwin Bennett, 1898. (Price 50 cts.)
- X. The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries Before Christ, by William Scott Ferguson, 1899. (Price 75 cts.)
- XI. Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia, Confecerunt Catherina Maria Gloth, Maria Francisco Kellogg, 1900. (Price \$1.00.)
- XII. A Study of the Greek Paeon, with Appendixes containing the Hymns found at Delphi and the other extant Fragments of Paeans, by Arthur Fairbanks, 1900. (Price \$1.00.)
- XIII. The Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus, not including Indirect Questions, by Charles L. Durham, 1901. (Price 80 cts.)
- XIV. A Study in Case-Rivalry, being an Investigation Regarding the Use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of *Remembering* and *Forgetting*, by Clinton L. Babcock, 1901. (Price 60 cts.)
- XV. The Case-Construction after the Comparative in Latin, by K. P. R. Neville, 1901. (Price 60 cts.)
- XVI. The Epigraphical Evidence for the Reigns of Vespasian and Titus, by Homer Curtis Newton, 1901. (Price 80 cts.)
- XVII. Erichthonius and the three Daughters of Cecrops, by Benjamin Powell, 1906. (Price 60 cts.)
- XVIII. Index to the Fragments of the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets, as Contained in the Hiller-Crusius Edition of Bergk's Anthologia Lyrica, by Mary Corwin Lane, 1908. (Price 80 cts.)
- XIX. The Poetic Plural of Greek Tragedy, in the Light of Homeric Usage, by Horace Leonard Jones, 1910. (Price 80 cts.)

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.,  
443 Fourth Ave., New York

# Readings in Greek History

By IDA C. THALLON, Vassar College

A book designed for students and teachers in Secondary Schools and for College undergraduates who wish to continue Greek history beyond the Preparatory School.

A collection of extracts from the primary sources of Greek history, covering the period from the time of Homer through the battle of Chaeronea.

Material hitherto unavailable for those unacquainted with Greek is placed at the disposal of the student.

638 pages, \$2.00



## GINN AND COMPANY

70 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

## Excellent for Supplementary Use

### Huribut & Bradley's Notebook for First Year Latin Vocabulary

Contains 650 classified words ordinarily met in first year work. On the blank page opposite each list the pupil writes the meaning of each word as he meets it.

### Reilly's Practical Exercises on the Latin Verb

This drill on the writing of over 100 verbs combines rapidity with thoroughness.

### Inglis's Latin Composition Exercise Book

Systematic training; the original exercises to be written on right-hand pages, the corrected sentences on the left-hand.

### Nutting's First Latin Reader

Affords excellent practice in translation "at sight". The 140 lessons present stories of early American history, short anecdotes, two simplified narratives from Caesar, and selections from the original text of Caesar, Nepos, Suetonius, Sallust, and Cicero.

### Gallup's Latin Reader

Easy reading lessons which are distinctive because written in classic Latin. Footnotes explain idiomatic constructions.

### Perception Cards for Pearson's Essentials of Latin

These 500 cards for drill and rapid review have proved very successful.

## AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. XI

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 11, 1918

No. 16

## AN INSTANCE OF MILTON'S DEBT TO THE GREEK PHILOSOPHERS

Evidence hitherto ignored indicates that Raphael, the "affable arch-angel", was an Aristotelian, or, more probably, a Neo-Platonist. In the course of his colloquy with Adam, Milton puts into the mouth of this "winged Hierarch" a bit of exposition that has received from critics far less attention than it deserves (Paradise Lost 5.469-497):

O Adam, one Almighty is, from whom  
All things proceed, and up to him return,  
If not depraved from good, created all  
Such to perfection; one first matter all,  
Endued with various forms, various degrees  
Of substance, and, in things that live, of life;  
But more refined, more spiritous and pure,  
As nearer to him placed or nearer tending  
Each in their several active spheres assigned,  
Till body up to spirit work, in bounds  
Proportioned to each kind. So from the root  
Springs lighter the green stalk, from thence the leaves  
More aery, last the bright consummate flower  
Spirits odorous breathes: flowers and their fruit,  
Man's nourishment, by gradual scale sublimed,  
To vital spirits aspire, to animal,  
To intellectual; give both life and sense,  
Fancy and understanding; whence the Soul  
Reason receives, and Reason is her being,  
Discursive, or Intuitive: Discourse  
Is oft of yours, the latter most is ours,  
Differing but in degree, of kind the same.  
Wonder not, then, what God for you saw good  
If I refuse not, but convert, as you,  
To proper substance. Time may come when Men  
With Angels may participate, and find  
No inconvenient diet, nor too light fare;  
And from these corporal nutriments, perhaps,  
Your bodies may at last turn all to spirit.

The idea here expressed of matter passing from a lower to a higher plane through the successive stages of a spiritual evolution, particularly the idea of the final stages of such an evolution—the complete spiritualization of the human body—was a favorite one with Milton. We find it in Comus, 459-463:

Till oft converse with heavenly habitants  
Begin to cast a beam on the outward shape,  
The unpolluted temple of the mind,  
And turns it by degrees to the soul's essence,  
Till all be made immortal.

We find, also, the converse of the idea—that the soul by self-indulgence may gradually be debased to body (Comus, 463-469):

But when lust  
By unchaste looks, loose gestures, and foul talk,  
But most by lewd and lavish act of sin,  
Lets in defilement to the inward parts,  
The soul grows clotted by contagion,  
Imbodies, and imbrutes, till she quite lose  
The divine property of her first being.

Still further illustrative of Milton's belief in the possible descent of the spirit to matter is the whole account in Paradise Lost of the progressive degradation of Satan—a debasement of which Satan is himself fully conscious, as appears in his monologue (9.163 ff.):

O foul descent! that I, who erst contended  
With Gods to sit the highest, am now constrained  
Into a beast, and, mixed with bestial slime,  
This essence to incarnate and imbrute,  
That to the highth of deity aspired!  
But what will not ambition and revenge  
Descend to? Who aspires must down as low  
As high he soared, obnoxious, first or last,  
To basest things.

Editorial comment upon these passages has not been illuminative. The older editors of Milton either ignored them altogether, or treated them with scant courtesy. Upon the passage cited above from Paradise Lost, Newton suggests that the whole idea was probably borrowed from the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. Todd disapproves of the idea expressed:

Our author should have considered things better, for by attributing his own false notions in philosophy to an archangel, he has really lowered the character which he intended to raise. He was much mistaken in his metaphysics. This notion of matter refining into spirit is by no means observing the *bounds proportioned to each kind*. I suppose he meant it as a comment on the doctrine of a natural body changed into a spiritual body as I Cor. XV., and perhaps borrowed it from some of his systems of divinity.

To dismiss the passage as an echo of St. Paul is absurd, for the chapter instanced from First Corinthians is a discussion of the resurrection, whereas Milton is obviously speaking not of a resurrection but of an evolution. Even less satisfying is the vague reference to some system of divinity. The whole idea is not so much a theological as a philosophical one. That Milton so considered it is evidenced by the Second Brother's comment upon it in Comus, 476 ff.:

How charming is divine Philosophy!  
Not harsh and crabbed, as dull fools suppose,  
But musical as is Apollo's lute,  
And a perpetual feast of nectared sweets,  
Where no crude surfeit reigns.



Acting upon the hint thus furnished, and seeking in the work of the Greek philosophers the source of Milton's theory, we find it in Aristotle and the later Neo-Platonists. Probably its earliest appearance is in Aristotle's *History of Animals*. The central thought of Aristotle's natural philosophy was development, or increasing perfection of structure, manifested in a genetic series from the polyps to man. Commenting upon this series, Aristotle speaks as follows (*History of Animals*, 8.1.2 ff.):

Nature passes so gradually from inanimate to animate things, that, from their continuity, their boundary and the mean between them are indistinct. The race of plants succeeds immediately that of inanimate objects; and these differ from each other in the proportion of life in which they participate; for, compared with other bodies, plants appear to possess life, though, when compared with animals, they appear inanimate. The change from plants to animals, however, is gradual . . . , for a person might question to which of these classes some marine animals belong; for many of them are attached to the rock, and perish as soon as they are separated from it.

From this, and from similar passages in his treatise on physics, it is evident that Aristotle believed in a complete graduation in nature, a progressive development by gradual transitions from the most imperfect to the most perfect. The lowest stage is the inorganic. This passes into the organic, matter being transformed into life. Plants are animate as compared with minerals, and inanimate as compared with animals. They have powers of nourishment and reproduction, but no feeling or sensibility. Then come the plant-animals, such as the sponges. Above these are the animals with sensibility, endowed with desires, and equipped with the faculty of locomotion to fulfil these desires. Finally, we find man as the highest point in one long and continuous ascent, physically superior in his erect position, in his purest and largest blood supply, and mentally supreme in his power to generalize and form abstractions. The various analogies that we find throughout the animal scale prove, Aristotle thought, the essential unity of nature by showing that all animate nature is subject to the same laws.

The practical identity of this belief with Milton's theory is at once apparent. The latter believed that God made matter, and that all matter is radically one, though reascending nearer and nearer its divine origin through a series of forms—inorganic, lower-organic, animal, human, and the angelic. In one respect, however, Milton's idea of the ascending scale is more Platonic than Aristotelian, in that it is more idealistic. Aristotle had considered man as the highest point of nature's progressive development; Milton believes that the gross, material element in man's nature may "by oft converse with heavenly habitants" be "turned by degrees to the soul's essence, till all becomes immortal". The whole idea is so Platonic, or rather so Neo-Platonic, as to lead one to seek its origin in the work of those who represented this—the last phase of Greek philosophy.

Most representative of the Neo-Platonists was Plotinus, who combined into one system whatever he deemed best in the philosophy before his time. The fundamental idea of Neo-Platonism as exemplified in Plotinus's philosophy is the existence of an ideal universe, an 'intelligible world', supra-sensuous, but yet knowable, and even visible to the rapt vision of the seer when he is in a state of ecstasy. This is the *Noûs*, or the divine Mind. It contains the archetype or paradigm of every object of the material order that we know<sup>1</sup>. The divine Mind impresses its ideas upon matter as with a seal, so that things are living expressions of a divine idea<sup>2</sup>. Like the fourth dimension in mathematics, which we may postulate and even represent in algebraic symbols, the intelligible world is subject in some degree to human investigation.

This intelligible world Plotinus considered as the second of the three essential principles, or 'divine hypostases', as he calls them, which together comprise the existence that transcends appearance. Superior to the intelligible world, its begetter and enlightener, is The Good, the center of the universe, the great First Cause. Subordinate to the intelligible world, and in turn enlightened by it, is the world soul. This animates the material universe, which is thus related to it as the human body is related to the human soul. The world soul and individual human souls are begotten by the creative mind of God, and are therefore equal, except that human souls, being incarnated, are limited and occasionally even debased, for sometimes, on account of the temptations of the flesh, a soul may sink into matter, and become wholly bestial. In such a case it will be reincarnated in an animal or a vegetable body.

It is especially in Plotinus's teaching regarding soul-culture that we get new light on Milton's conception of the soul's ascent. Plotinus's idea is briefly this: God is not only the ruler, but the enlightener of the universe. Toward him every creature naturally turns, as the sunflower turns toward the sun, in the degree that its nature permits, or, as Milton says,

in bounds  
Proportioned to each kind. . . .

Moreover the power of turning toward God, and the length of the ascent toward its highest good measures accurately the character of the particular object in question. This ascent of all creation toward its own highest good Plotinus regards as a natural instinct of love—a turning of the thing begotten to its begetter, a love answering to the love of that which produced it. The soul of the universe possesses universal love, and each individual soul has its own individual love. Love is, then, the natural impulse of the human soul desiring

<sup>1</sup>Milton appears to have been entirely familiar with this idea. He calls angels "Intellectual substances" (P. L. 5.408) and makes Raphael say to Adam (P. L. 5.575-577)

though what if earth  
Be but the shadow of Heaven, and things therein  
Each to other like more than on earth is thought!

<sup>2</sup>Plotinus, *Enneades* 6.7.8.

<sup>3</sup>*Enneades* 4.4.13.

its own highest good<sup>4</sup>. Possessing this love in itself, even though ignorant of its possession, the soul seeks earnestly, longing to attain that highest good, and holds in deserved contempt mere fleshly beauty<sup>5</sup>. The degradation of the soul occurs, Plotinus thought—and here, too, the likeness to Milton's thought will be at once apparent—, when the soul becomes corrupted with the contagion of the flesh, or, to use Milton's phrase,

Imbodies and imbrutes, till she quite lose  
The divine property of her first being<sup>6</sup>.

From what has been said, it would appear that Milton combined with Aristotle's idea of a genetic series Plotinus's more idealistic conception of the relation of human souls to the world soul. A closer scrutiny of Plotinus, however, shows that Milton may have found in the *Enneades* the whole idea of spiritual evolution that he sets forth in *Paradise Lost* 7.469 ff. Plotinus believed that all nature, both animate and inanimate, was endowed with soul<sup>7</sup>. Though Milton's belief is somewhat less definitely stated than Plotinus's, it is quite evident that he too believed that the lower animals, and even inanimate things possessed souls. Animals reason, he tells us<sup>8</sup>:

Is not the Earth  
With various living creatures, and the Air,  
Replenished, . . . ? Know'st thou not  
Their language and their ways? They also know,  
And reason not contemptibly;

and again,

To beasts, whom God on their creation-day  
Created mute to all articulate sound;  
The latter I demur, for in their looks  
Much reason, and in their actions, oft appears<sup>9</sup>.

. . . whence the soul  
Reason receives, and Reason is her being<sup>10</sup>.

. . . But know that in the soul  
Are many lesser faculties, that serve  
Reason as chief<sup>11</sup>.

Hence, it is not surprising to find Milton, in his account of creation, repeatedly designating the animals, even the fishes and reptiles, as "living souls"<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, in the hymn of praise they sing in 7.153 ff., Milton represents Adam and Eve as calling upon inanimate nature—the stars, the elements, earth, water, air, and fire; "mists and exhalations"; the pine trees, "with every plant"—, exhorting them all to join their voices in the *Te Deum* whose music is to be the gladness of the world. And, what is most significant, these inanimate things are all addressed as "living souls".

<sup>4</sup>Enneades 3.4.4.

<sup>5</sup>Enneades 6.7.31.

<sup>6</sup>Enneades 1.8.13.

<sup>7</sup>Enneades 3.2.7.

<sup>8</sup>P. L. 8.369 ff.

<sup>9</sup>P. L. 9.556-559.

<sup>10</sup>P. L. 5.186-187.

<sup>11</sup>This idea of the supremacy of reason as a faculty of the soul is

to be found in Plotinus also: see Enneades 6.9.3.

<sup>12</sup>P. L. 7.187-192, 451-454. His respect for our poor relations, the animals, Milton may have acquired from Seneca, who says of them (*De Ira* 3), *Muta animalia humanis affectibus carent, habent autem similes illis quosdam impulsus*.

Plotinus believed that the soul's proper activity, which is love, caused it to aspire to its own highest good<sup>13</sup>. The degree of the 'good' attainable by any individual soul, Plotinus thought, was limited by the nature of the body that enclosed it, 'for this', he says, referring to the world soul (*Ερως*), 'would be that which implants the desires, the soul aspiring according to the nature of each, and each soul begetting a love analogous to its own as far as pertains to its worth and being'.

No less clearly does Milton indicate (P. L. 5.508 ff.)

the way that might direct  
Our knowledge, and the scale of Nature set  
From centre to circumference, whereon,  
In contemplation of created things,  
By steps we may ascend to God.

The means of ascent, the "scale" (Latin *scala*, ladder) by which men rise till their earthly nature puts on immortality, is "love":

Love refines  
The thoughts, and heart enlarges—hath his seat  
In Reason, and is judicious, is the scale  
By which to Heavenly Love thou may'st ascend,  
Not sunk in carnal pleasure<sup>14</sup>;

Milton, no less than Plotinus, recognized that there are differences in souls, some being

As nearer to him placed or nearer tending  
Each in their several active spheres assigned,  
Till body up to spirit work<sup>15</sup>.

In other words, the souls of animals and plants are by their very nature farther from their goal, and, also, more limited in their capacity to develop. These, therefore, can ascend only

in bounds  
Proportioned to each kind<sup>16</sup>. . .  
or, as Plotinus says, *κατὰ φύσιν ἐκάστης*.

Though Milton nowhere specifically mentions Aristotle's *History of Animals*, his numerous references to him, and the fact that Aristotle held so important a place in the Cambridge curriculum in Milton's day, establishes a probability of his acquaintance with it. Milton mentions Aristotle six times in his collected prose writings, and in terms that imply a careful reading of the Greek philosopher. Of these references, five are to Aristotle's political treatises, while the other is to his work on the general principles of natural science. Of the seven Latin *Prolusiones Oratoriae*<sup>17</sup>, or rhetorical exercises, written by Milton while he was at Cambridge, and included among the *Epistolae Familiares* of 1674, five contain references to Aristotle. The reference in the third of these essays, which is an attack upon the scholastic philosophy, is most significant as indicating the esteem in which Aristotle was held by the Univer-

<sup>13</sup>Enneades 3.4.4.

<sup>14</sup>P. L. 8.589 ff.

<sup>15</sup>P. L. 5.479-478.

<sup>16</sup>P. L. 5.478-479.

<sup>17</sup>Probably to be classed, as Masson suggests (*Life of Milton* 1.230-231), among those academic exercises is the curious satiric poem, *De Idea Platonica quemadmodum Aristoteles intellexit*, in which Milton ironically assumes the attitude of a literal-minded Aristotelian questioning the reasonableness of the Platonic theory of ideas.

sity students of Milton's time. Here Aristotle is named as one "who is much delighted in, and who has left almost all these things scientifically and exquisitely written for our learning".

Such an estimate as is implied in this tribute was justified by the position of Aristotle in the curriculum of Cambridge in the early seventeenth century. Grammar, logic, and rhetoric formed what was called the Trivium; and the great authority was Aristotle. Though his supremacy was beginning to be disputed, he still retained his authority as representing the rigid scholastic discipline out of which the University was just beginning to emerge. Of this authority Masson says (1.197):

Not only were his logical treatises and those of his commentators and expositors used as text-books, but the main part of the active intellectual discipline of the students consisted in the incessant practice, on all kinds of metaphysical and moral questions, of that art of dialectical disputation, which, under the name of the Aristotelian method, had been set up by the schoolmen as the means of universal truth.

In view of Milton's own testimony to his acquaintance with much of Aristotle's work, and in view of the position Aristotle is known to have occupied in the intellectual life of Milton's day, the assumption that Milton had read Aristotle's *History of Animals* appears not unwarranted.

Though Milton nowhere specifically mentions Plotinus, he can hardly have failed to know his philosophy. It was popular with the leaders of the Latitudinarian movement of the middle of the century. Burnet, in his *History of My Own Times* (6.187), speaking of one of the Cambridge divines who headed the movement, says of him:

He was much for liberty of conscience: and being disgusted with the dry systematical way of those times, he studied to raise those that conversed with him to a nobler set of thoughts. . . . In order to this, he set young students much on reading the ancient philosophers, chiefly Plato, Tully, and Plotin. . . .

The interest in Plotinus antedates considerably, however, the development of the Latitudinarian movement. Six months before Milton quitted Cambridge, Henry More, the Platonist, as he came to be called, entered Christ's College. He subsequently became a fellow, then a tutor, and finally master of Christ's, residing at the University till his death in 1687. Throughout his life, More seems to have regarded it as his mission to naturalize in modern Christendom the teachings of Oriental and Greek philosophy. In one of his early poems, *Psychozoia*, or *The Life of the Soul*, he declares (Canto I, St. 4):

So if what's consonant to Plato's school  
(Which well agrees with learned Pythagore,  
Egyptian Trismegist, and th' antique roll  
Of Chaldee wisdom, all which time hath tore  
But Plato and deep Plotin do restore)  
Which is my scope, I sing out lustily:  
If any twitten me for such strange lore,  
And me all blameless brand with infamy,  
God purge that man from fault of foul malignity.

To his mission as a demonstrator of the reasonableness of the Christian faith More remained faithful to the end of his life. In every way possible he sought to strengthen faith by applying an antidote to the prevalent scepticism, of French origin, and to the no less prevalent fanaticism, or, as he called it, "enthusiasm", of German origin. Constantly his aim was to reconcile faith and knowledge<sup>18</sup>. Neither the pagan philosophy of the past, nor the science of his day, he contended, was really, as was commonly supposed, subversive of the Christian faith. Consequently he endorsed the Copernican, as opposed to the Ptolemaic, system, of astronomy, condemning the persecutors of Galileo<sup>19</sup>; and he cordially accepted the Neo-Platonic philosophy<sup>20</sup>, and the literature of the Cabala<sup>21</sup>, in so far as he found these consonant with Christianity. By the middle of the seventeenth century, when his *Antidote against Atheism* appeared (1656), More had already acquired a brilliant reputation both for learning and piety. The extent of his fame warrants the belief that Neo-Platonic idealism and cabalistic mysticism were alike widely disseminated, and renders highly probable the assumption that Milton was among those influenced by these ideas.

That such was indeed the case is rendered the more probable by numerous correspondences in the subjects discussed by More and by Milton. Raphael's reticence, for example, in his reply to Adam's question (P. L. 8. 615 ff.),

Love not the Heavenly Spirits, and how their love  
Express they—by looks only, or do they mix  
Irradiance, virtual or immediate touch?

#### Raphael's Answer

Let it suffice thee that thou know'st  
Us happy, and without Love no happiness.  
Whatever pure thou in the body enjoy'st  
(And pure thou wert created) we enjoy  
In eminence, and obstacle find none  
Of membrane, joint, or limb, exclusive bars.  
Easier than air with air, if Spirits embrace,  
Total they mix, union of pure with pure  
Desiring, nor restrained conveyance need  
As flesh to mix with flesh, or soul with soul. . . .

is supplemented by More. In his treatise on *The Immortality of the Soul* (Book 2, Chapter 9, Section 4), More speaks as follows of the employments of the angels:

These sing, and play, and dance together, reaping the lawful pleasures of the very Animal life, in a far higher degree than we are capable of in this World. . . . The sweet motions of the Spirits in the passion of Love can very hardly be commanded off from too near bordering upon the shameful sense of Lust. . . . But in that other state, where the fancy consults with that First Exemplar of Beauty, Intellectual Love and Vertue . . . , nothing there can be found amiss,

<sup>18</sup>"For I conceived Christian Religion rational throughout". More says in his Preface to his *Collected Works*, published in 1662. In the same Preface he tells us he has adopted Cicero's motto, *Rationem, quo ea me cunq̃ue ducet, sequar*.

<sup>19</sup>In the *Psychozoia*: or a Platonick Song of the Soul (1642).

<sup>20</sup>E. g. in the *Immortality of the Soule* (1659).

<sup>21</sup>E. g. in the *Conjectura Cabbalistica* (1653).



every touch and stroke of motion and Beauty being conveyed from so judicious a power through so delicate and deperate a Medium. Wherefore they cannot but enravish one anothers Souls, while they are mutual Spectators of the perfect pulchritude of one anothers persons and comely carriage. . . . These, and such like Pastimes as these, are part of the Happiness of the Best sort of the Aereal Genii.

Another of the pastimes of the angels, according to More, was disputation.

It may be also a great controversie among them, whether Pythagoras's or Ptolomie's Hypothesis be true concerning the Motion of the Earth<sup>25</sup>.

This certainly reminds us strongly of Raphael's cautious and rather evasive answer to Adam concerning celestial motions, in which he declares that God has not revealed these secrets even to angels.

the rest

From Man or Angel the great Architect  
Did wisely to conceal, and not divulge  
His secrets, to be scanned by them who ought  
Rather admire. Or, if they list to try  
Conjecture, he his fabric of the Heavens  
Hath left to their disputes—perhaps to move  
His laughter at their quaint opinions wide<sup>26</sup>. . . .

Most pertinent to the matter in hand of all the correspondences that might be instanced is More's discussion of a genetic series<sup>25</sup>, or, to employ Milton's phrase, a "gradual scale" of life<sup>26</sup> from what More calls "seminal forms" to "angelical souls". This passage, though too long to quote, is obviously based upon the same sources as Milton's, and by itself furnishes conclusive proof, if not that Milton was acquainted with More's work, at least that Aristotelian<sup>27</sup> and Neo-Platonic ideas were the common property of the learned in Milton's day.

The problem of determining with any degree of exactness Milton's debt to the classical influences that formed his mind is difficult and indeed impossible of solution. No quantitative analysis of his epic to determine the exact proportion of each influence in its composition has been made, nor can it ever be made. The effect of Aristotelian and of Neo-Platonic thought upon Milton is, nevertheless, both ascertainable and unmistakable.

Though this influence has been hitherto ignored, it is evident in the speeches of Raphael, who, in addition to his capacities as an arch-angel, seems to have possessed considerable "depth in philosophy". In the philosophy that he puts into the mouth of the "affable arch-angel" Milton's interest may have been stimulated and kept alive by his presumable familiarity with the work of his gifted fellow-collegian Henry More. At all events, it was of long standing, as his earlier poetry conclusively proves.

The particular idea that Raphael expresses has appealed not only to Milton but to later poets also.

<sup>25</sup>The Immortality of the Soul, 3.9.2.

<sup>26</sup>P. L. 8.71 ff.

<sup>27</sup>The Immortality of the Soul, 1.8.

<sup>28</sup>P. L. 9.107-113.

<sup>29</sup>It is noteworthy that More in this passage refers specifically to Aristotle.

Shelley, for example, in his *Adonais* (379-387) speaks thus of Keats:

He is a portion of the loveliness  
Which once he made more lovely: he doth bear  
His part, while the one Spirit's plastic Stress  
Sweeps through the dull dense world, compelling there  
All new successions to the forms they wear,  
Torturing th' unwilling dross that checks its flight  
To its own likeness, as each mass may bear;  
And bursting in its beauty and its might  
From trees and beasts and men into the Heaven's light.

UNIVERSITY OF  
ILLINOIS.

EDWARD CHAUNCEY BALDWIN.

## REVIEWS

A Study of the Cognomina of Soldiers in the Roman Legions. By Lindley Richard Dean. Princeton: The Princeton University Press (1916). Pp. 321.

The Princeton University dissertation before us shows a satisfactory mastery of the technical processes of research and an altogether praiseworthy industry; the Alphabetical List alone, which covers 193 pages, is in itself an extremely laborious undertaking. The general conclusions, however, are somewhat disappointing, a result due no doubt mainly to the fact that, as only a limited amount of time is ordinarily available for writing a dissertation, the collection of so large an amount of material can hardly leave leisure for an exhaustive analysis of the same. After all, military names do not seem to differ very greatly from civil names, and a comprehensive study of general nomenclature will be necessary before valid conclusions for the whole subject can be drawn. The chronological line of approach, whereby the disappearance of names of one type and the production of those of another might be traced, would give us a history of style in nomenclature, which, with proper safeguards, might be employed perhaps in giving an approximate date to otherwise indeterminate inscriptions. That has not been attempted here, and would, of course, have been quite impossible with the limitations set for this particular study.

After an Introduction, devoted mainly to a statement of generally known facts about cognomina, the fifty-two most popular cognomina among the 1333 listed (a minimum of twenty occurrences is the criterion of popularity) are discussed. The second chapter takes up the classification of cognomina according to thirty-eight rubrics, such as adjectives of different kinds of signification; nouns, diminutives, praenomina, etc., as cognomina; cognomina ending in -a, -anus, -ianus, etc.; and, finally, cognomina of Arabic, Celtic, Greek, and other national origin. Chapter III treats double cognomina, uncomplimentary cognomina, and the like. Then follow the Bibliography and a long list of abbreviations employed, and, finally, we have the Alphabetical List, which contains some 5700 different entries under more than 1300 cognomina.

The presentation is reasonably clear, but reading has been made not infrequently difficult by the marked

aversion to footnotes and the consequent inclusion of confusing quotations and references in the body of the text. In the extensive Bibliography I notice only the omission of J. M. Bang's excellent study, *Die Germanen im Römischen Dienste bis zum Regierungsantritt Constantins I. I. Teil* (Berlin, 1906), which might well have been used in more than one place. The list of abbreviations shows a mystifying irregularity in the use of the period; one rather common abbreviation, "E. E.", is not explained at all. But it is useless to dilate upon such things. Those who accuse classical studies of fostering a barren cult of form have obviously not read widely in recent dissertational literature. Indeed, in emulating the strictly scientific procedure of our colleagues in the natural and physical sciences there may be some danger that classical scholars will become *plus royaliste que la roi*.

One serious deficiency is the failure to provide an index, which is especially desirable in a Material-sammlung like the present. With the great extension of the literature in recent times it is impossible for one to read through every work upon any subject in which one is interested, or even all the literature about those subjects upon which one is tempted to write. There was ample room in the Alphabetical List for a series of page references to the treatment of each name, and a very little more work would have made the present collection much more serviceable. For example, the interesting name Saturninus is discussed on pages 48, 49, 62, 72, 110, 114, 115, and possibly elsewhere.

The chapter on classifications is probably the least satisfactory, partly because the names have not always been exhaustively considered, but more because the rubrics are either not sufficiently inclusive or else not sufficiently numerous. Thus, the first rubric, "Adjectives denoting Qualities suited to men in Military Service", is unnecessarily restricted, because no other rubric takes up substantives denoting such qualities, and so a number of significant cognomina bearing upon this general topic of the suitability of the cognomen are not considered except in the general discussion. *Militio*, which is listed, is not an adjective, and *Torquatus*, though the name of an ancient hero, does not in itself denote a military quality. Other adjectives—*Memor*, *Prudens*, *Sedulus*, *Asper*, *Obsequens*, *Pius*, and *Serenus*—would perhaps not be out of place here.

Under the second rubric, Adjectives denoting Physical Characteristics, there is the same error of omitting substantives of the same kind, with the result that such expressive cognomina as *Bucco*, *Capito*, *Elefans*, *Fronto*, *Glabrio*, *Naso*, *Auriculus*, *Homullus*, *Omuncio*, *Flavius*, *Glaucus*, *Longinus*, *Macrinus*, *Nigrinus*, *Paetinus*, *Plato*, *Pyrrhus*, *Burrus*, *Strabo*, *Valens*, and the like are not considered. The ordinary adjective *Robustus* might have been included, while *Barosus* probably belongs under the next heading. The third rubric, Adjectives denoting Mental or Moral Characteristics, likewise omits such substantives as *Hilario*, *Derisor*, and *Rixula*, but also such adjectives as *Audax*,

*Acer*, *Celer*, *Catus*, *Ferox*, *Festus*, *Fidus*, etc., in fact all of list one, although there is nothing in the two rubrics that makes them mutually exclusive. *Serranus*, it might be noted further, is probably a misprint of *Serrenos*, and *Sterceius* (page 117) may well contain a reference to service as a dry nurse (compare *sterceia*) rather than a "moral characteristic".

Under "Participle Adjectives", *Mansuetus*, *Moderatus*, *Prudens*, *Quietus*, *Respectus*, *Sanctus*, *Sedatus* and a few others might have been listed; and under complimentary cognomina *Curta* might have been considered, with *Horace*, *Sermones* 1.9.70, in mind.

Numerous interesting questions suggest themselves as one reads this dissertation, some of which, it may be hoped, Dr. Dean will answer for us in further studies for which he is amply equipped. For example, what evidence may there be to show which physical type, light or dark, preponderated in the Roman army of the late Empire? That is, are names like *Crispus*, *Niger*, *Fuscus*, and the like much more frequent than *Candidus*, *Flavus*, *Rufus*, etc.? At first blush one might be inclined to think that blondes are represented in the army, by cognomina at least, in a much larger proportion than they probably formed of the general population. If that be true, we should have a new kind of evidence to support the belief that the legions under the Empire were in large part composed of men of either direct or secondary Northern origin. Obvious qualifications to the strength of such arguments will suggest themselves, but the topic might at least be considered farther.

Again, it appears that the number of soldiers drawn from comparatively large cities is surprisingly great when we bear in mind the superior physique and morale of men from the countryside and small villages. One might perhaps fairly conclude that a considerable source of supply for the armies was found in the city proletariat, precisely as in Great Britain prior to the present war—a circumstance which does not speak very well for the general efficiency of the armies of the later Empire.

One wonders also whether the surprising frequency of names like *Datus*, *Donatus*, *Optatus*, *Rogatus*, *Impetratus*, which Toutain and Herzog rightly explain as 'the child asked for in prayer', 'the child given in answer to prayer', beside hinting at Semitic origin in the beginning (of course they soon spread to non-Semitic elements of the population), may not reflect the falling off of population which characterized the decadent Empire. When the birth rate is very low or declining rapidly, parents often earnestly pray for one or two children, and are apt to regard their birth as a manifestation of divine favor. When families are normally large, however, the birth of a child calls for no comment, and occurring frequently is not apt to be made a special object of supplication.

The cognomina of national origin other than Italic are most interesting. Among the oriental nations represented the number of Egyptian and Semitic names



is notably small, as we should expect, partly no doubt because of the frequency of Greek names among these national stocks, but in the main no doubt because of a disinclination for military service. That the millions of Egypt should furnish so few soldiers is noteworthy, and in part perhaps justifies the contempt which the Romans (especially Hadrian) felt for the inhabitants of that country. The number of Greek cognomina, on the other hand, is truly surprising, 328 out of a total of 1313, and, when one bears in mind that often a good Latin name conceals a foreign nationality, one gets striking confirmation of the fact that the Roman legions were Roman for the most part in name only. The share which the Greek-speaking East bears in the upkeep of the legions is creditable, and in part explains the astonishing vitality and military vigor of the Greek Empire for centuries under blows the like of which completely wrecked the Western Empire in a few decades.

It is interesting likewise to observe how numerous are the Celtic cognomina (eighty in all), showing how tenaciously the Celts clung to their national language, whereas there is but one of certainly Germanic origin, and of mixed or possibly Germanic origin but four, despite the large number of Germans who are known to have served in the army. We have here no doubt a racial characteristic. The proud, self-conscious Celt clung to his old name, while the good-natured, easily assimilated German willingly gave up all connection with the fatherland, and became, as far as he could, Roman in name as well as in citizenship.

As for other names, one might venture to guess that the frequency of the name Sabinus among men born in the various parts of the Empire may be due to the good reputation for honesty and sobriety which the Sabini long enjoyed. Most singular is the long list of men called Saturninus. The marked predilection for this name seems to be inadequately accounted for by the explanation that it is a mere derivative from Saturnus, whether he be the somewhat old-fashioned and amiable Roman deity, or simply the equivalent of any Semitic Baal. May not the early identification with the extremely cruel and malignant Carthaginian Baal have imparted to the name the suggestion of an especial appropriateness for the military profession? That singular transformation whereby the benevolent Saturn through the instrumentality of astrological speculation became transformed into a lowering, sinister and malevolent influence may throw an oblique light upon the popularity of the name in the camps. Certainly a soldier with a *noli me tangere* disposition who was 'Saturnine' in this secondary sense would be a dangerous foe.

Many other interesting considerations are suggested by Dr. Dean's dissertation, but I must bring this already too lengthy review to a close; and this I do by thanking the author for the excellent collection of material which he has made, and repeating the hope that he will continue the studies which he has auspiciously inaugurated in this important field. Research here is certainly no mere *studium supervacua discendi*.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS. W. A. OLDFATHER.

The Days of Alcibiades. By C. E. Robinson. New York: Longmans, Green, and Company (1916). Pp. xxiv + 301. 16 Illustrations. \$1.50 net.

This volume consists of a Historical Introduction, and twenty-one sketches hung around the career of Alcibiades, with the following titles:

I. Alcibiades' Boyhood; II. An Attic Farm; III. Ephebes; IV. Delphi; V. A Battle at Sea; VI. A Land Battle; VII. The Mysteries of Eleusis; VIII. A Dinner-Party; IX. The Market-Place; X. A Funeral; XI. Olympia; XII. The Great Dionysia; XIII. An Ekklesia; XIV. A Wedding Festival; XV. A Home in Athens; XVI. Athens; XVII. Panathenaea; XVIII. Peiraeus; XIX. Sparta; XX. A Trial by Jury; XXI. Barbary.

The author could not have found a more fascinating hero for his purposes than the versatile and ever-youthful Alcibiades—the ward of Pericles, the favorite pupil of Socrates, now the Olympian victor, now the statesman (415 B. C.), now the traitor (411 B. C.), now the savior of Athens (411 B. C.). But, since the leading purpose of the book is to depict the manners, customs, and general atmosphere of the Age of Pericles, the author does not profess, of course, to conform to the strict canons of scientific history. Accordingly, although whenever possible he draws his materials—actual events and anecdotes—from contemporary monuments and authors, his sources range all the way from Aristophanes to Plutarch and Lucian.

In this way I have hoped to reproduce truly and with fair completeness, the habits of an Athenian gentleman, how he dressed, ate, and spent his day, how he talked, and what he thought, the scenes he saw and the places he visited.

Mr. Robinson has admirably accomplished his purpose. He has succeeded in throwing about Alcibiades the appropriate atmosphere and spirit of the times, in a style as modern and fluent as it is Hellenic and free from pedantry. For the neophyte in Greek studies there is a big foretaste of what lies beyond, a mass of otherwise prosaic facts served up in palatable fashion; and for the scholar there are not only familiar facts and scenes, but some of the unfamiliar as well—all strung on a fairly straight thread of story.

For example, take the seventh sketch, The Mysteries of Eleusis (72-85). This sketch alone justifies the writing of the book, for it affords the reader precisely the visualization he cannot secure from a muddle of detached facts and disquisitions. And, while the author's description is clear and vivid, he has been careful to restrain his imagination within due bounds. Of course Alcibiades must first discourse with Socrates upon such an important matter as taking the Sacred Degrees.

"Come, give me an answer, Sokrates, and let there be no evasions. How comes it, pray, that you, who in

other matters of religion are the most scrupulous of men, have never yet enrolled yourself among the number of the Initiate?" "Softly! my dear Alcibiades, softly! I cannot answer you yet. For lies it not with you rather to act as teacher to me and to convince me first, that, by so doing, I should be the gainer? Do you therefore answer my question and tell me the truth. If you become the apprentice to the cobbler, would it not be in the hope of learning something new about boots and shoes?"

The reader may then follow Alcibiades through the wearisome preliminaries—the period of arduous probation, of ghastly admonitions, of humiliating scrutiny, and of scrupulous dieting, by which means the dude and scandal of Athenian society becomes clean-handed and pure-hearted, ready for the holy ordeal. In the opening ceremony Alcibiades must provide for sacrifice his own small black pig—a pig that conforms to the required specifications, without blemish and, in particular, not minus its tail. And so on, until the great Rites on the second evening. In the great Hall of the Mysteries Alcibiades

sat upon a stool, his head and figure enveloped in a white shroud. He heard a priest behind him muttering incantations in odd, unfamiliar phrases. . . . Thus perfected, it was his privilege now to enter with the rest the great illuminated hall. It must have been a man of sluggish temper who would not at such a moment be moved to an almost insupportable emotion. Many indeed gave bent to their distress by groaning dismally like tortured souls at a revival meeting.

The candidate had already been told to await the drawing of the veil, and to expect the fullest of revelations. The lights go out; a voice from the darkness chants a jargon; this jargon the candidate had already memorized, as also the response which he now proudly gives: "I have fed from the timbrel; I have drunk from the cymbal". Then the light flashes on; the apparition (a man of superhuman size, seated upon a winged chariot and surrounded by writhing serpents) shows for an instant, and the light flashes off. Then cryptic voices again, and another tableau (the Sacred Marriage), and various other visions of the underworld, and finally the "monstrance" by the High Priest of the Sacred Wheat Ear—symbol of immortality. The story of Alcibiades's visit to Delphi and his consultation of the oracle in order to learn what his calling in life shall be (38-48) is equally vivid.

It is much easier to see the demerits of the volume than to appreciate the author's difficulties in arriving at certain conclusions, among them, to what class of readers the book should be addressed. He has chosen to make "concessions" to "those who have had no Greek"; and he obviously expects his work to be virtually useless as a manual. Although numerous quotations are given, exact citations are rarely given. Thus, he fails in most cases to call the reader's attention to moot points, and to give brief statements with the appropriate citations. And even in matters that are largely conjectural, as in the scenes representing the trireme (facing page 49) and the theater (facing page

162), he risks misleading his reader. However, the note on the arrangement of the oars of the trireme is an exception, and is a fair example of what would have added greatly to the value of the book, if such notes, though briefer, had been inserted throughout. Surely in these respects the earnest student who may not be content with the story alone is entitled to "concessions" in the second edition.

Mr. Robinson's freshness of style, his intimate knowledge of Athenian private and public life, and his happy choice of hero, all suggest an expansion of the present work (together with a companion volume perhaps) to supersede the *Charicles* of Becker.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

HORACE L. JONES.

#### A FEW SUGGESTIONS FOR THE LATIN TEACHER WITH A BACKWARD OR A CARELESS CLASS<sup>1</sup>

In First Year Work: Do not assign a lesson until it has been carefully taught in class. We Classical Teachers are probably agreed that the recitation period should be much more than a quiz, the purpose of which is to discover whether or not the pupil has prepared his lesson. Let us then be sure that no new topic is assigned, whether it be a new declension, a new rule of syntax, or a new vocabulary, which has not already been developed in class. Drill may be furnished by calling upon the pupils for oral sentences to illustrate the new point that has been emphasized. A few of the best of these sentences, if written on the blackboard and then copied into note-books, may be used as a part of the next day's lesson. Encourage the pupils to construct original sentences, both for oral and written exercises.

Never forget that you are teaching that unknown tongue, English, as well as the foreign Latin.

In Second Year Work: It is probable that most teachers, if they were asked to state the purpose of the course in second year Latin, would define it somewhat as follows: to develop an appreciation of sentence structure; to add to the pupil's stock of Latin words; and so to increase his English vocabulary by a study of the formation of English derivatives; to evolve power in interpreting and facility in English idiom; to give from original sources some knowledge of the great military movement that led to the extension of Roman civilization among our ancestors in northern Europe. It is not essential that your answer be in these same terms, but it is of vital importance that you yourself know clearly what is the aim of your teaching. With this distinctly in mind, you are more likely to succeed. Let the work be a development, with each lesson carefully graded. Especially in reviewing the forms and syntax of the first year, do not try to cover too much ground at one time. The subjunctive in purpose clauses will do for one lesson; the gerundive with "ad" for another. Above all, make your assignments definite, giving full instructions as to the best methods of using the notes and vocabulary. By frequently preparing a lesson with a class, teach them how to study. Consciousness of improvement is the pupil's best incentive to work.

<sup>1</sup>This material is taken from a two-paged sheet, entitled *Hints for the Classical Teacher in the Secondary School*, issued by The Ancient Language Section, Schoolmen's Week, University of Pennsylvania, in April, 1917.